

Subject: KROSSATCH

Source : E. Stakheim

Date : 29 Jul 1964

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3828
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

1. On 11 Jul 1964 Source visited Subject at his home (206 E 6th St, NYC) from 19.15 to 21.15 hrs and then both went to /nearby bar where they talked till 01.15 hrs. During Source's stay in Subject's apartment there were two telephone calls from YAROVII of New York whom Subject, on this occasion, called an agent of the FBI and agent-provocateur; one telephone call from a lady speaking Polish who fixed an appointment with Subject for the next day at 12.00 hrs, and a call from a Russian speaking lady at about 20.10hrs who wanted to know who was the guest at Subject's home he was just entertaining. Source assumed that she was from the Soviet Mission in New York. Subject talked with her in somewhat "coded" terms using such terms as "tankisty", "trydrusia" (three friends) and it seemed she had some difficulty in understanding him. At the end of their conversation Subject asked her to bring him again "portelivka" ("krainien horilka"). Incidentally, Subject was well stocked with Soviet spirits and was very generous in filling Source's glass while trying himself to drink as little as possible.

About his trip/ Subject talked in a fragmentary way jumping from one topic to another and often repeating himself. He showed Source about 30 photographs taken in the Ukraine mostly with Ukrainian writers and poets he met there. He promised to give them to Source when leaving for Kiev in two-three months.

2. Subject claimed to be satisfied with his trip although all the time he was watched, "guided", and restricted in his movements, according to the schedule worked out for him by his hosts. The latter financed his trip from and to the States, too. Actually, he had some trouble with his trip because

for some time they expected him to pay travel expenses ^{out of} ~~from~~ his own pocket. Finally he told KYZIA that he was unable to raise so much money and KYZIA took care of it.

Several times Subject stressed that since he is planning to return for good to the Ukraine, he is bound to be very careful and obviously cannot talk too much. Moreover, that "they" (meaning the KGB) knew much" and among other things asked him whether he talked with Uncle and Source himself. According to Subject he replied that he met them accidentally, and in his opinion TSURKAN Valentin was the one who had told the KGB about the meetings with Uncle and Source.

While in Kiev Subject did not meet TSURKAN who at that time was in ODESSA vacationing. TSURKAN definitely returned for good to KIEV. He has been replaced in the Permanent Delegation of Ukr SSR in New York by a young intelligent man by the name KRAVCHUK or KRAVETS. The latter has already arrived in New York.

3. This summer there will come to the United States a larger delegation of Ukrainian writers and poets and Subject will gladly introduce Source to them. On this occasion he mentioned that he had helped to contact PIDSUKHA last year and knew about Source's encounter with SOBKO. Subject remarked that Source could always contact people from the Ukraine through the Mission of Ukr SSR in New York.

4. The situation in the Ukraine Subject described as "not rosy". On the contrary there is a strong justification drive but he was quite hopeful as to strength of Ukrainian potential. He believed in Ukrainian people he met and saw, and they need his help. His and many others' abroad. Subject is convinced that he can do much more for his people there, in the Ukraine than here abroad. And that's why he decided to return to Kiev. He was told to do so by many individuals - poets, writers and others - he had met in the Ukraine, including also those of young generation like DIACH and others.

The only one who told him that he was not going to give him any advice was PAVLYCHKO, Dmytro. He saw him once tete-a-tete and once in company

of DRACH Ivan in KIEV. Some of them even indicated to him that since RYLSKYI was very ill and won't live for long (~~indeed~~ N.B. he died in the meantime) Subject could be the one to become "a new rallying symbol" for them in the Ukraine. Subject saw RYLSKYI in Kiev but they did not talk for very long. It was Source's impression that RYLSKYI probably ignored Subject but he did not want to admit that.

Subject differentiates following political forces in the Ukraine at the present: a/ servile Russified Communists - "kholui" who constitute the main instrument of Russian anti-Ukrainian policy;

b/ honest Ukrainian communists and patriots ~~whom~~ one might call even nationalists. In his view they are true representatives of Ukrainian masses and of Ukrainian communist party. Being in the party and having responsible positions they are able to promote Ukrainian cause and ~~were~~ ^{are} acting accordingly. To them belonged SHCHERBYTSKYI who was very popular in the Ukraine. Their domain is, however, ^{primarily} literature and art. He praised particularly

KOMACHENKO, Vasil
VORONKO, Platon
GHEZATSKYI, Volodymyr
NAZARENKO
PIDJUKHA, Alexandr
PROKHORENKO (?)

NAZARENKO was described by Subject as a bohemian of extreme sort - a writer-bum. They all are convinced communists but at the same time Ukrainian patriots as well. To the same category Subject adds the young generation, that of DRACH, KOROTICH, HURBALO and other.

c/ Remnants of Ukrainian nationalists, mainly in West Ukraine. Often they maintain contact with arch-reactionary old, catholic intelligentsia. The latter is so much anti-Soviet that it even prefers to support Polish churches "instead of their own". Into the same category Subject includes sympathisers of "Petliarivshchyna" (from Simon Petlura) whom he met in Volhynia among his relatives.

5. Subject has no doubt whatsoever that Moscow wants to russify the Ukraine. All are aware of that and hate Russians. When Source remarked that probably not all Russians were chauvinists and imperialists Subject vehemently denied it. In his opinion Source was completely wrong because all Russians were dying now with chauvinism. Before going to the Ukraine Subject was of the same opinion as Source but after what he saw and was told in the Ukraine he changed his view completely. "Ukrainians hate Russians, Russians into Ukrainians and there is no use to deny or conceal it". "Ukraine is a Russian colony", "Khrushchev wants to transform all Ukrainians into 'Khakhly' and thus finish us off", these were the expressions Subject used. In Moscow Subject spoke to some Russians. He met a taxi-driver who complained in his turn about Ukrainians telling him that 'Khakhly' were coming more and more to Moscow and were taking over all power in their hands.

Later on, ending the talk, Subject asserted that in spite of all he told Source before, the Ukraine was on the way to become "a satellite" and at least this was the ambition of Ukrainian communists he met.

6. From what Subject was told by his relatives in Volhynia the collective farms system turned out to be a complete failure. If the regime wants "to save the situation" it will have to fully change its agricultural structure and policy. Subject himself was shocked by misery he saw and was told about by his relatives. DEILAS was absolutely right when he had written about "the new class" and its slaves. Of course, Subject himself was going to join this new class not only for material consideration but mainly because those were people with influence and power. He mentioned KORNIIYCHUK as the biggest "lord" of the new class among writers and poets.

7. According to Subject in order to help Ukrainian people in the Ukraine it is necessary to organize abroad an extremely leftist but "national" group of Ukrainian emigres which would officially and unofficially deal with Kiev within the framework of cultural exchange. In his words such a group must accept Subject's political platform but at the same time to use such a tactic as to not alienate itself from the rest of Ukrainian emigration. The so called "progressives" (Ukrainian communists in the States and in Canada) are no good because they are simply too stupid and too weak to perform this function. This must be a serious group, something like "Vpered"-group (Ivan Maistrenko's) at one time was. That's a pity - Subject remarked - that people like KOLUNYCHENI Vasvolod (of New York) changed their mind and became opportunists.

In Subject's opinion "Prolog"-group should help in organizing such an organization. ~~Moreover~~. Moreover, that its attitude to the Soviet Ukraine has changed remarkably and those people have a realistic approach to the situation there. Subject did not think, however, that Prolog itself would be suitable for such a function. ~~At least~~ - he stressed again - people from Prolog could help. As he discovered even Uncle himself changed to a very extent his views and on this occasion he wanted to know what connections existed between Uncle and Source.

8. Subject also hinted that he ^{had} sent some message for Uncle "from Kiev". People like SHABA (with whom he had a long talk), LEVISHCHENKO and others ~~had~~ had a very high respect for Uncle and he was very well known to, and "popular" among them.

9. At one moment Subject said that he was quite pressed by the KGB in Kiev. Particularly female officers were very nasty and inquisitive though tactful, of course. They ~~female officers~~ are called "suchki" (bitches).

KOLOSOVA is one of them. All other members of the Committee for cultural contacts with compatriots abroad he met in Kiev must fit into same category. They are just KGB-scoundrels. So is LEVISHCHENKO who is in charge of political affairs of Ukrainian emigration, and ~~also~~ MOLOCH, Yuri, to the latter is Jewish. Subject met him in Kiev. Once they passed by Korolenko-prison and MOLOCH pointing at it said that "during Stalin's rule there had been a real hell in it".

10. Together with PIDUKHA Alexandr and his wife Subject went by car from KIEV to POLTAVA. On the border of Kiev and Poltava oblasts they were welcomed by a kolhosp-delegation headed by the chairman of the local collective farm. After the latter started to welcome Subject and PIDUKHA in Russian, the latter upbraided him severely for not speaking Ukrainian and Pidukha's anger seemed to be genuine. Pidukha's wife is a medicine doctor and "a typical plump Ukrainian woman". "But they both are good Ukrainians and good people."

11. In Kiev Subject talked twice with DRACH, Ivan, once alone, and once he was accompanied by PAULICHKO, Dmytro. DRACH asked Subject to return to the Ukraine and "help them". DRACH also complained and felt sorry at the same time that "just because a Hala Horbach writes some unnecessary comments we have - against our conviction - to attack her in the press". They did not mind being reprinted abroad but without "unnecessary commentaries". Subject said that DRACH and other colleagues of his had in mind above all KRAVTSIV, Bohdan and KOSHELIVSKI, Ivan.

12. Subject met in Kiev HUTSALO, Evhen (Ukrainian poet) and complimented him for his poems. HUTSALO only thanked him and "made impression of a young, very honest, shy man".

13. In Kiev Subject had a long talk with SKADA. In his opinion he is "an orderly man and not a bad Ukrainian. Still rather young (about 40), intelligent, smart. SKADA reads "Suchasnist" and was very much interested in Uncle, Source,

14. At a meeting of Subject with members of the Union of Ukrainian Writers in Kiev Subject was asked by them about Prof SHEVELOV-GORLAKH, BABULAKH, OSMACHKA, BABA, HUMENNA and other Ukrainian scholars and writers abroad. Particularly SHEVELOV seemed to enjoy a ~~general~~ great respect and interest. When these 'enquires' were going on for some time, suddenly DMYTERKO, Lubomyr stood up and shouted: "why do you ask so much about those scoundrels?" His outburst was very badly and angrily received and everybody gave him a dirty look but kept silent. According to Subject, DMYTERKO is hated by his colleagues and they cannot "stomach him".

15. Subject did not talk with DZIUBA but asked his colleagues about him. He was told that for some time DZIUBA remained "an unemployed writer but did not give in".

16. According to Subject, SAVA-HOLOVANSKYI of Kiev is Jewish but a good Ukrainian, and an honest man. He asked Subject to convey to writers abroad to enter into correspondence with their colleagues in the Ukraine in order to directly exchange views and works. He told Subject "that now you can easily send us your books and write us letters and we shall receive them".

17. KIDENKO'S book on Judaism - according to Subject - was described to him in the Ukraine by people he met in Kiev as a provocation of Russians "to put Ukrainians again into trouble". Subject said that anti-semitism in the USSR was very strong and in the Ukraine he often heard expressions like "Moscow and Jews" meant in a derogatory sense.

18. When staying in a dacha near Kiev Subject was introduced there to PALAMARCHUK, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukr SSR. They exchanged greetings only.

19. BAZHAN, Mykola told Subject that they are making efforts to rehabilitate KHYLOVYI, and there will come time when they must achieve that. BAZHAN said that

20. Ukrainian poets and writers Subject met in Kiev and Lvov knew about the answer of 62 of their colleagues abroad to the appeal of 34' from the Ukraine. When Subject asked them whether there will be any continuation of the dialogue he was told that this was up to the Central Committee of the CUkraine to decide. "We alone - they said - cannot do much".

21. In Lvov Subject was given a reception-party at the University. Beside Prof Maximovich there was his wife- KIKH Maria, RUDNYTSKYI Mykhailo and others. Subject described RUDNYTSKYI as a spineless coward.

In Lviv Subject had also a reception-party at Irene WILDE'S house. There were about 20 people among them his former friends. Some of them asked about George L. There Subject also met KOSSANATLSKY who in his opinion is an honest man and a good Ukrainian. On this occasion he also mentioned a Ukrainian architect who was working now on Franko's monument and whom Subject described as "ab-ukrainian nationalist" like KOZACHEMKO, PTOSUSIA and others. Irene WILDE told Subject that the late MELNYCHUK had done very much for Ukrainian literature in spite of his writings against nationalists. She merited him with obtaining the rehabilitation of CHAIKOVSKY Andrei (Ukrainian writer).

22. In LVIV, Subject talked with STEFANYK Semen. The latter pretended to be a big shot wielding real power. Subject thought, however, that he had very little power "despite the fact that - as he put it - Stefanyk smokes ^{the} cigarettes that only highest echelon in the party can get hold of". This he was told by his cousin in Volynia when he showed those cigarettes given by Stefanyk.

23. Subject was not allowed to see RYVAK though he asked for. His request was simply ignored.

24. Subject ^{SAU}MEYHUL (MEYHAL) in Lviv. The latter told him that he was released from prison 6 years ago and now felt fine. He asked Subject to

convey to his family in the States that they should not worry about him.

25. In LUTSK Subject met a local Ukrainian who is "big shot" there. He has his picture. The man was after Stalin's death released from concentration camp "and hated nationalists".

26. Subject suggested that he might introduce Source to some interesting Poles but he did not elaborate who they were.

27. Subject expressed opinion that new changes in the Ukraine were inevitable and in 2-3 years all people incl. Source will be able to go to the Ukraine. He remarked that now Source eventually could send his son to study in Kiev.

28. In Kiev Subject met Mykola FRANKO (aged 72). The latter complained very strongly against Russians and as Subject discovered he was known as much to many people. No one did anything to him because they considered him "half-crazy".

29. In Moscow Subject spoke to KHEVITSKA and other members of the Lviv-Theatre performing at that time in the capital of the Soviet Union.

30. In Donbas Subject travelled by car. He visited MAKIUPOL, DONETSK, MAKIIVKA, KREMATORSK, ZIDANOV. Some Ivan Pavlovych had accompanied him on his tour in Donbas. In DONETSK they watched together a football-game. There they also met a high Komsomol official (from oblast) who was Russian but spoke Ukrainian.

Subject was tremendously impressed by industrial grandeur of Donbas, and remarked that "if Russians would leave us alone we would have our own America but instead they exploit us like colonialists". Subject also complained that Donbas was russified.

31. Subject did not participate in Shevchenko-celebrations in Moscow and Kiev. He was late and managed only to get in time to Kanev.

32. Subject wanted to know whether Source's brother Volodymyr had the same political convictions and opinions as he himself. On this occasion he mentioned that STANA, LEVISHCHENKO and others were very much interested in "Suchasnist".

33. Subject was given in Kiev a Shevchenko-medal with a certificate and showed it to Source.

34. According to Subject, KYZIA warned him that YAROVYI was an agent of the FBI and an provocateur, and therefore Subject should be careful with him.